

REMARKS:

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 9, 10, 12, 33, 40 and 41. Claim 9 are amended herein, and new claim 42 is added. Claim 41 is cancelled without prejudice. No new matter is presented. Thus, claims 9, 10, 12, 33, 40 and 42 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e):

Claims 9, 10, 12, 33, 40 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,047,252 (Kumano). As mentioned above, claim 41 is cancelled herein without prejudice.

Kumano divides text of a first language into component units, generates component units of a second language by translating each of the divided text of the first language and links component units of the first language text with component units of the second language text. The translation portion (130) of Kumano performs machine translation for each unit of the source text output from the text-dividing portion (120) and outputs a result of translation of a source text unit in the form of a target text unit. That is, the translation portion (130) performs machine translation of all source text without recognizing that the translation is specified or requested and the translated result is outputted to target text output file (160) (see, FIGS. 1 and 29 including corresponding texts).

According to the present invention, information that is specified to be translated is translated by the relay device and the information not specified to be translated is not translated.

Independent claim 9 recites, "switching over said relay devices when accessing the network", where when recognizing that the translation is specified, "said routing unit accesses the network to obtain the information translated by said first relay device, and when recognizing no specification of the translation, said routing unit accesses the network to obtain the information that is not translated from said second relay device."

The Examiner further relies on FIG. 27 of Kumano to reject claims 33 and 40. However, FIG. 27 of Kumano is limited to displaying a state in which only the target text to which a user has scrolled to from the target text shown in FIG. 26 that has been translated in its entirety (i.e., in response to movement (scroll) through the target text).

Independent claims 33 and 40 recite, "editing document data having text information and display control information for the text information", where "a part or the whole of the document data in the process of being edited is translated into the language specified."

Kumano does not teach or suggest "switching over said relay devices", as recited in claim 9 and "a part or the whole of the document data... being edited is translated into the language specified", as recited in claims 33 and 40.

It is submitted that the independent claims 9, 33 and 40 are patentable over Kumano.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from independent claim 9 are patentably distinguishable over Kumano. The dependent claims are also independently patentable. For example, as recited in claim 12, the display unit includes "a plurality of screen areas displaying the information", where "the information before being translated and the translated information are displayed respectively in the screen areas different from each other." Kumano does not teach or suggest these features of claim 12.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIM:

New claim 42 is added to recite, "determining whether an original text is requested to be translated into a translated text of a specified language" and "switching between transmitting the original text without translating the text upon determining translation is not requested and transmitting the translated text upon determining translation is requested." Claim 42 further recites that the original text and the translated text is displayed "side-by-side, each piece thereof arranged with respect to a corresponding predetermined part, when the translation of the original text is requested."

Kumano does not teach or suggest, "determining whether an original text is requested to be translated to a translated text of a specified language" including "switching between transmitting the original text without translating... and transmitting the translated text" based on the determining, where the texts are displayed "side-by-side", as recited in claim 42.

Thus, it is submitted that new claim 42 is patentably distinguishable over Kumano.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 05/22/2006

By: Temnit Afework
Temnit Afework
Registration No. 58,202

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501